

**EXHIBIT 4**

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION, CIVIL PART  
MIDDLESEX COUNTY  
DOCKET NO.  
A.D.# \_\_\_\_\_

1  
2 KIMBERLY NARANJO, )  
3 ) TRANSCRIPT  
4 Plaintiff, ) OF  
5 )  
6 vs. ) MOTIONS  
7 )  
8 JOHNSON & JOHNSON, ET AL., ) DOCKET NO. L-6108-21AS  
9 )  
10 Defendant. )  
11 )  
12 WALTER PRESSLER, ET AL., ) DOCKET NO. L-1944-23  
13 JUSTIN BERGERON, ET AL., ) L-2089-23  
14 MABLE DUMAS, ET AL., ) L-2090-23  
15 GEORGES EL-RAMADI, ET AL., ) L-2092-23  
16 LUCILA CRUZ, ET AL., ) L-2093-23  
17 GEORGE BOYLE, ) L-2094-23  
18 SUSAN DROLET, ) L-2095-23  
19 MARISA MAGEE, ) L-2268-23  
20 CONNIE SIMS, ) L-3923-20  
21 ROALIA GAGLIARDI, ET AL., ) L-3805-18  
22 )  
23 Plaintiffs, )  
24 )  
25 vs. )  
26 )  
27 KENVUE, ET AL., )  
28 )  
29 Defendant. )

**VOLUME 1 OF 2**

Transcriber, Sherry M. Figliolino  
G&L TRANSCRIPTION OF NJ  
330 Changebridge Road, Suite 101  
Pine Brook, New Jersey 07058  
[www.gltranscripts nj.com](http://www.gltranscripts nj.com)  
[transcripts@gltranscripts nj.com](mailto:transcripts@gltranscripts nj.com)

Sound Recorded  
Recording Operator,

1 just like this case. And even -- and there are  
2 multiple cases, which I will walk through, that say  
3 that liability attaches even when there's a disclaimer  
4 of liability.

5 The mere fact that J&J assigned liability to  
6 LTL to decide who ultimately is going to pay inside  
7 their little world has no impact on the responsibility  
8 to their parties. That's between J&J, LTL, and the J&J  
9 defendants. It does not impact New Jersey law.

10 So, what's the standard of review? As Mr.  
11 Dubin mentioned, this is a motion to dismiss where all  
12 the allegations in the complaint have to be accepted as  
13 true and those allegations include not just the facts  
14 and the 90 pages that we included, probably the most  
15 comprehensive pleading ever filed here in a talc case,  
16 but the affidavits that were attached and the SEC  
17 statements. So, the premise that somehow -- that  
18 somehow not every fact was pled is just inaccurate.

19 The issue of successor liability -- and this  
20 goes to the second motion as well -- is ultimately a  
21 factor, first, to be addressed by the Court on summary  
22 judgment if a motion is made, and secondly, ultimately,  
23 for the jury. And it's worth noting, I think, to start  
24 that there is no reported post-RAMIREZ case finding no  
25 successor liability on the pleadings. Okay? Not one

1 dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 4:6-2E.  
2 Seminal case is PRINTING MART V. SHARP ELECTRONICS, 116  
3 N.J. 739. That requires the Court to search the  
4 complaint in depth and with liberality to determine if  
5 a cause of action can be gleaned even from an obscure  
6 statement, particularly, if discovery is taken.

7 Every reasonable inference is, therefore,  
8 accorded the plaintiff and the motion granted only in  
9 rare circumstances and ordinarily without prejudice.  
10 So, while there are a number of cases that are part of  
11 this today, the Court did take time to review the  
12 BERGERON complaint in depth with the attachments  
13 therein. The Court is satisfied that this is not a  
14 case that should be dismissed because it satisfies the  
15 requirement of PRINTING MART, satisfies Rule 4:6-2E.

16 The Court is satisfied that the plaintiffs  
17 are not attempting to circumvent the bankruptcy court  
18 and that this is not about LTL. But certainly here  
19 today in the pleadings, BERGERON and the other  
20 pleadings that have been made as to these defendants  
21 before the Court now, there is enough there for the  
22 defendant -- for the plaintiffs to proceed forward,  
23 certainly, to discovery and for the defendants to renew  
24 their motions for summary judgment at the appropriate  
25 time.